

Message Text

PAGE 01 USUN N 01165 030257 Z

71-61

ACTION IO-13

INFO OCT-01 L-03 AF-10 ARA-11 EA-11 EUR-25 NEA-10 RSC-01

DODE-00 PM-09 NASA-04 NSC-10 SCI-06 RSR-01 ADP-00

/115 W

----- 088887

R 030217 Z APR 73

FM USMISSION USUN NEW YORK

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 7286

INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

AMEMBASSY PARIS

AMEMBASSY OTTAWA

USMISSION NATO

C O N F I D E N T I A L USUN 1165

E. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: TSPA, PFOR, UN, CA, FR, MX

SUBJECT: OUTER SPACE LEGAL: REGISTRATION OF SPACE OBJECTS

1. SUMMARY. REVISED CANADA- FRANCE REGISTRATION CONVENTION INTRODUCED. MEXICO CALLED FOR ADVANCE REGISTRATION, ESPECIALLY FOR ERS SATELLITES.

2. DETAILS. AT APRIL 2 OUTER SPACE LEGAL SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING CANADA (MILLER) INTRODUCED REVISED CANADIAN-FRENCH DRAFT REGISTRATION CONVENTION CHARACTERIZED AS EMBODYING THREE MAIN ELEMENTS: COMPULSORY REGISTRATION, PROMPT SUBMISSION OF INFORMATION, AND UPDATING OF INFORMATION. NEW TEXT, MILLER SAID, RESULTED FROM CANADIAN-FRENCH BILATERAL CONSULTATIONS DURING PAST YEAR (TEXT IS ESSENTIALLY SAME AS THAT HANDED OVER AT CANADIAN- US BILATERAL IN DECEMBER 1972).

3. SITUATION SINCE YEAR AGO, MILLER CONTINUED, HIGHLIGHTED BY " VERY POSITIVE DEVELOPMENT": US COMING OUT IN FAVOR OF MANDATORY REGISTRATION SYSTEM. ON BEHALF OF CANADIAN GOVT, MILLER EXPRESSED APPRECIATION FOR THIS " INTERNATIONALLY ENLIGHTENED CHANGE OF POLICY," AND HOPED
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 USUN N 01165 030257 Z

OTHER STATES ACTIVE IN SPACE WOULD BE AS FORTHCOMING IN INTERESTS OF ALL HUMANITY. MILLER SAID CANADA AND FRANCE

HAD NOT HAD TIME FOR FULL CONSIDERATION OF NEW US DRAFT
TEXT BEFORE TABLING THEIR REVISION, BUT HAD BORROWED US
LANGUAGE TO PRESERVE SPIRIT OF CONCILIATION01 OF 02 030156 Z

LAST NIGHT ON RECEIPT OF STATE 060026 THAT I WOULD BE REQUESTING
APPOINTMENT WITH ALMEYDA THIS MORNING. LETELIER ASKED ME IF THIS
MEANT INTERPRETATION I HAD GIVEN HIM LAST SATURDAY OF U. S. POSITION
WAS ESSENTIALLY CORRECT. I SAID "YES." LETELIER TOLD ME HE WAS
HAVING DINNER WITH ALMEYDA AND WOULD FILL HIM IN - SO ALMEYDA
HAS BEEN AWARE OF ESSENTIAL THRUST OF MY CALL SINCE THEN.

3. THIS AFTERNOON I BEGAN BY EXPLAINING BACKGROUND - CHILE
HOY AND OTHER ARTICLES, MY CONVERSATION WITH LETELIER, AND FACT
THAT I HAD CONSULTED DEPARTMENT AND WAS SPEAKING UNDER
INSTRUCTIONS. I ADDED THAT WE HAD PROBLEMS ENOUGH BETWEEN US
WITHOUT MISUNDERSTANDING EACH OTHER'S TRUE POSITIONS AND POINTS
OF VIEW.

4. I MADE THE POINT THAT OUR POSITION IS NOT ONE OF REJECTING
THE 1914 TREATY - THOUGH WE HAVE SERIOUS RESERVATIONS ABOUT ITS
ADEQUACY. I REMINDED THE FONMIN AND LETELIER THAT WE HAVE
EXPRESSED THESE RESERVATIONS OVER A PERIOD OF MANY MONTHS, AND
THEY SAID THEY UNDERSTOOD THE NATURE OF THEM. I ALSO MENTIONED
TO THE FONMIN THAT WE HAD FIRST UNDERSTOOD THAT THE TREATY
PROPOSAL WAS INTENDED TO BE FORMAL AND FIRM ON THE SATURDAY
BEFORE THE TALKS, AND THIS WAS A VERY BRIEF PERIOD IN WHICH TO
EXPECT US TO HAVE A DEFINITIVE POSITION.

5. I NOTED THAT THE UNITED STATES HAD NOT PUT FORWARD AN
ENABLING CHILEAN CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AS A DEMAND, AND WENT
ON TO MAKE THE EXPLANATION CONTAINED IN PARAGRAPH 1 OF STATE
060026. ALMEYDA SAID IT WAS THE "LOGIC" OF OUR DESIRE FOR A
COMMITMENT TO IMPLEMENTATION THAT LED ONE STRAIGHT TO THE ENABLING
AMENDMENT, SAYING THAT AN AMENDMENT WOULD BE THE ONLY WAY FOR
CHILE TO BE ABLE TO MAKE SUCH A COMMITMENT. HE SAID HE RECOGNIZED
OUR VIEW THAT CHILE WANTS ACTION FROM US WHILE CHILE TALKS OF
ATMOSPHERICS. HOWEVER, HE THOUGHT IT WAS OUR DEMANDS FOR
DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE COMPANIES THAT WERE ATMOSPHERICS -
AS THEY WERE SO CLEARLY UNREALIZABLE IN THE PRESENT CHILAN
POLITICAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT - WHILE THE CHILEAN SUGGESTION
OF THE 1914 TREATY WAS SOMETHING WE COULD ACTUALLY DO NOW TO
MAKE PROGRESS.

6. PICKING UP ALMEYDA'S REFERENCE TO DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS WITH
THE COMPANIES, I MADE THE POINTS ON THIS SUBJECT CONTAINED IN
STATE 060107. LETELIER ANSWERED MY STATEMENT ABOUT PARAGRAPH 2
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 SANTIA 01364 01 OF 02 030156 Z

OF ARTICLE 4 WITH NOW- FAMILIAR ARGUMENTS ABOUT OUR HAVING
AGREED TO DISAGREE AT PARIS. ALMEYDA ADDED THAT AGREEING WITH

OUR POINT OF VIEW ON PARAGRAPH 2 OF ARTICLE 4 WOULD ESSENTIALLY BE ACCEDING TO OUR OVERALL POSITION. I SAID I WAS SURE THEY KNEW WE DISAGREED ON PARAGRAPH 2 OF ARTICLE 4 BUT SUGGESTED THAT IT WAS NOT WORTHWHILE AT THE MOMENT TO GO AROUND THE ARGUMENTS AGAIN.

7. I RAISED THE CHILEAN EXPANSION OF THE 1914 TREATY CONCEPT TO INCLUDE OTHER ISSUES (STATE 060107). I NOTED THAT WE REGARDED THE 1914 TREATY AS A SMALL AND LEAKY CRAFT IN ANY CASE, AND QUESTIONED WHETHER IT FURTHERED OUR MUTUAL PURPOSES TO TRY TO LOAD THAT BOAT WITH GREAT, UNWIELDLY PIECES OF ADDITIONAL FREIGHT. ALMEYDA'S RESPONSE WAS THAT CHILE'S DESIRE WAS NOT TO LOAD UP THE TREATY MECHANISM WITH A LOT OF THINGS, BUT THAT THE IDB ISSUE AND THE USE OF THE BANK FOR OTHER THAN ITS CHARTER PURPOSES WAS AN ISSUE OF EVEN MORE IMPORTANCE TO THE CHILEANS, PERHAPS, THAN THE ISSUE OF COPPER COMPENSATION WAS TO US. ALMEYDA SAID IT MIGHT BE USEFUL FOR US TO TALK ABOUT AN AGREED PRESENTATION TO THE 1914 TREATY COMMISSION, AND SEE HOW CLOSE OR FAR APART WE MIGHT BE. HE INDICATED IT MIGHT NOT BE NECESSARY FOR THE COMMISSION TO STUDY A WHOLE SERIES OF QUESTIONS AT THE SAME TIME AND IN THE SAME CONTEXT, BUT ADDED THAT THE TREATY WAS THE ONLY BILATERAL TREATY MECHANISM WE HAD IN FORCE, AND IT SHOULD BE AVAILABLE TO THE CHILEANS ON ISSUES THEY REGARDED AS OF DEEPEST CONCERN AS WELL AS TO US. I SAID I UNDERSTOOD HIS POINT, BUT I HOPED HE ALSO UNDERSTOOD THAT CHILE'S 1914 TREATY PROPOSAL WOULD NOT BE ADDITIONALLY RECOMMENDED IF IT WERE PUT IN A CLEARLY UNMANAGEABLE CONTEXT.

8. I THEN MADE THE POINT THAT OUR POSITION WAS NOT THAT OF A RUPTURE OR BREAKDOWN IN TALKS AT OUR BEHEST. ALMEYDA TOLD ME HE WAS GRATIFIED TO KNOW THAT. I WENT ON TO EXPRESS OUR INTENTION TO STUDY CHILEAN POSITIONS AND PROPOSALS SERIOUSLY, AND EXPRESSED THE HOPE THEY WOULD ALSO DO SO. I NOTED THAT OUR POLICY AND POSITIONS REMAINED UNCHANGED, AND THAT WE CONTINUE TO SEEK A RESOLUTION OF OUR DIFFERENCES.

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 02 APR 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 03 APR 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: boyleja
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973USUNN01165
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: USUN NEW YORK
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730459/abqcdyvt.tel
Line Count: 146
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: boyleja
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags: ANOMALY
Review Date: 03 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <03-Aug-2001 by boyleja>; APPROVED <17-Sep-2001 by boyleja>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: OUTER SPACE LEGAL: REGISTRATION OF SPACE OBJECTS
TAGS: TSPA, PFOR, UN, CA, FR, MX
To: STATE INFO MOSCOW
PARIS
OTTAWA
NATO
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005